

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission is responsive to the Office Action of February 6, 2009, in which claims 1-5 and 11-20 are presently pending. Of those, claims 1-5 and 11-20 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0014733 of Ringseth, et al. In addition, claim 15 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringseth, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0155842 of Yeung, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0014733 of Ringseth, et al.

The Applicants have carefully reviewed the teachings of Ringseth and respectfully submit that it does not in fact teach each and every element of the claims as presently pending. More specifically, Ringseth does not teach that the SOAP header is configured to include message meta-data and semantic type information describing at least a portion of the content of the SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantic type information included in the SOAP message header.

In support of the §102 and §103 rejections, the Examiner provides the following mapping of the claim language at issue to specific portions of the Ringseth reference:

“generating message meta-data within a header of a simple object access protocol (SOAP) message having a SOAP message body (FIG. 3A/B, FIG. 14A-F); paragraph 10; 31-33; paragraph 143), said meta-data describing at least a portion of the content of said SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver (430, FIG. 4B) to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantic type information

included in the SOAP message header (FIG. 4B; FIG. 14A-F; paragraph 86-87; paragraph 41-42).”

Reviewing the above-cited portions of Ringseth, it will be seen that FIGS. 3A and 3B merely illustrate the basic formatting of an exemplary SOAP message. (Paragraphs [0015], [0051]-[0059]) In this regard, Ringseth teaches no more about SOAP messages than was known in the art at the time of Applicants’ invention. Indeed, Applicants also discuss aspects of conventional SOAP based communications in paragraphs [0014]-[0017] of the specification.

As to Ringseth’s teachings in FIGS. 14A-F, paragraph 10, paragraphs 31-33, and paragraph 143, such subject matter is related to compile-time declarative modeling for SOAP-based data transmissions to minimize the amount of coding required of a developer when generating SOAP-based web services. In more detail, a compiler 1402 begins parsing a C++ file that contains a web service description. With respect to SOAP attributes, although the compiler 1402 can “recognize” and “process” various SOAP handler, header and process attributes (paragraphs [0139]-[0145]), nothing in this compiling description actually teaches process the *content* of the SOAP message *body* using the *meta-data and semantic type information* included in the SOAP message *header*.

For at least this reason, Ringseth does not anticipate any of the pending claims, nor does the combination of the Ringseth and Yeung references render any of the claims obvious. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicants have addressed and overcome the current rejections over the art of record.

Finally, newly added claims 31-40 reintroduce the subject matter of previously cancelled system claims 21-30. With respect to previous §101 rejections in the present application, the Applicants point out that claims 31-40 do not recite “software per se” (i.e., computer programs claimed as computer listings). Rather, the claims include

structural recitations (e.g., send side SOAP handler, meta-data processor, etc.) and, as such, are statutory. In addition, newly added claim 40 recites that the dynamic exchange of semantic type information and meta-data information for open content message exchange between the sender and the receiver is implemented without changing message format of the message body. Support for this amendment is found at least in paragraphs [0018] and [0023] of the specification. The Applicants also respectfully submit that, notwithstanding the above, claim 40 is separately patentable on this additional basis.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
JOSHY JOSEPH, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By /Sean F. Sullivan/
Sean F. Sullivan
Registration No. 38,328
Customer No. 46429

Date: May 1, 2009
Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929